



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/687,835	10/20/2003	Stefan Thiesen	32140-191339	9919
26694	7590	04/01/2005	EXAMINER	
VENABLE, BAETJER, HOWARD AND CIVILETTI, LLP			NGUYEN, TRINH T	
P.O. BOX 34385			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20043-9998			3644	

DATE MAILED: 04/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/687,835	THIESEN ET AL.
	Examiner Trinh T Nguyen	Art Unit 3644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM  
 THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 February 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
      1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
      3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                     | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                                  |



**DETAILED ACTION**

***Continued Examination under 37 CFR 1.114 After Final Rejection***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/14/05 has been entered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 7-9, 12, 13, 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DE 100 57 673 (DE'673; please refer to corresponding U.S. 6,536,351 for a complete translation).

For claim 1, DE'673 discloses a fragment projectile comprising: a projectile casing (5) having a hollow interior space; heavy metal fragments (4) filling the hollow space; an ejector charge (5) disposed at the rear of the hollow space to eject the fragments from the projectile casing, when activated, during the flight of the projectile, the ejector charge causing the projectile casing to rupture at most at an opening in the

front of the projectile casing through which the fragments are ejected; and means (3) for activating the ejector charge at a desired time during the flight of the projectile.

DE'673 lacks the teaching that the fragments filing at least half of the hollow space. However, whether the fragments filing at least one fourth or one sixth or half of the hollow space is a matter of design choice, since applicant's specification is silent that this particular claimed feature solves any problems or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the amount of fragments that taught in DE'673. Furthermore, note that in paragraph [0006] of applicant's specification, only "the heavy metal fragments at least partially filling the hollow space" is required.

For claim 2, DE'673 further discloses the means for activating, activates the charge at a predetermined time during the flight of the projectile.

For claim 3, DE'673 further discloses the means for activating is a timer (see line 41 of col. 2 of U.S. 6,536,351).

For claim 7, DE'673 further discloses the means for activating includes a timer or proximity fuse to ignite the ejector charge (see line 41 of col. 2 of U.S. 6,536,351).

For claim 8, DE'673 further discloses the fragments are spherical (see lines 5-7 and 43-44 of col. 2 of U.S. 6,536,351).

For claim 9, DE'673 further discloses the fragments are formed of tungsten heavy metal (see lines 5-7 and 43-44 of col. 2 of U.S. 6,536,351).

4. Claims 4-6, 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DE 100 57 673 (DE'673) in view of Feldmann (U.S. 4,970,960).

DE'673, as described above, discloses most of the claimed invention except for indicating that the fragment projectile is a subcaliber projectile provided with a propelling cage sabot.

Feldmann teaches a fragment projectile (12 in Figure 1, 24 in Figures 2 & 3, 41 in Figure 4, and Figures 9 & 10) which is a subcaliber projectile provided with a propelling cage sabot (14, 16). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the fragment projectile of DE'673 into a subcaliber projectile with a propelling cage sabot, in a similar manner as taught in Feldmann, in order to provide a projectile with a desirable ballistic efficiency and high hit probability characteristics.

For claim 5, DE'673 as modified by Feldmann (emphasis on DE'673) further discloses the fragments are spherical (see lines 5-7 and 43-44 of col. 2 of U.S. 6,536,351).

For claim 6, DE'673 as modified by Feldmann (emphasis on DE'673) further discloses the fragments comprise tungsten heavy metal (see lines 5-7 and 43-44 of col. 2 of U.S. 6,536,351).

5. Claims 10 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DE 100 57 673 (DE'673) in view of DE 15 78 135 (DE'135).

DE'673, as described above, discloses most of the claimed invention except for indicating fins that stabilize the projectile during flight.

DE'135 teaches a similar projectile as that of DE'673 in which DE'135's projectile includes fins (13) so as to provide stability to the overall projectile during flight. It would

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the fragment projectile of DE'673 so as to include fins, in a similar manner as taught in DE'135, in order to provide stability to the overall projectile during flight.

6. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DE 100 57 673 (DE'673) in view of Altenau et al. (US 6,041,713).

DE'673, as described above, discloses most of the claimed invention except for indicating that the ejector charge is a pyrotechnical charge.

Altenau et al. teach a similar projectile as that of DE'673 in which Altenau et al.'s projectile includes a pyrotechnical charge (15). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the fragment projectile of DE'673 so as to include a pyrotechnical charge as a ejector charge, in a similar manner as taught in Altenau et al., since it is well known in the art to use pyrotechnical charge as a source of charge to cause explosion in projectile.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed 2/14/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

8. The examiner agreed with the applicant regarding the reference DE'673 discloses an explosive charge 5 that ruptures the casing at many points. Therefore, note that many points would include at most at an opening in the front of the casing since applicant did not define the relative intensity or amount of the term "at most".

***Conclusion***

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Trinh T Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306-9082. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30 A.M to 6:00 P.M).

The examiner's supervisor, Teri Luu can be reached on (703) 305-7421. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Trinh T Nguyen  
Patent Ex.  
Art Unit 3644  
3/8/05